UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes, *Editor in Chief*

Associate Editors

Francis Neilson Louis L. Mann Curtis W. Reese

A Pioneer of Jeffersonian Democracy

By CHARLES F. DOLE

The Story of My Experiments with Truth

Chapter XVI. By M. K. GANDHI

The Challenge of the Godless Saint

By JOSEPH ERNEST McAFEE

VOLUME XCIX NUMBER 22

Chicago, July 26, 1926

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

UNITY

Subscription, $3.00 per Annum

(Established 1878)

A JOURNAL *of the* RELIGION *of* DEMOCRACY

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, EDITOR IN CHIEF

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

FRANCIS NEILSON LOUIS L. MANN CURTIS W. REESE

UNITY Fellowship

FRANK C. DOAN
CHARLES F. DOLE
ZONA GALE
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES
H. R. MUSSEY
FRANCIS NEILSON
EDMUND H. REEMAN
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Managing Editor
EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE

Pamphlet Mission

FOR

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER

IN

RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:

ROBERT COLLYER, Chicago. WM. C. GANNETT, St. Paul.
JENKIN LL. JONES, Janesville. C. W. WENDTE, Cincinnati.
J. C. LEARNED, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.
Per Year, $1.00. Single Number, 10 Cents.

FRANCIS L. ROBBINS, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. SUNDERLAND, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
GEO. W. COOKE, Grand Haven, Mich, - } "Notes and News."

Editorial Contributors

W. Waldemar W. Argow
Charles E. Beals
Harry Foster Burns
Percy M. Dawson
James Waldo Fawcett
David Starr Jordan
George Saranton
Anna Garlin Spencer
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
James H. West

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—Charles Strong
AUSTRIA—Stefan Zweig
BULGARIA—F. M. Matthéeff
CANADA—Sidney Snow
CHINA—Gilbert Reid
ENGLAND—Fred Hankinson
Walter Walsh
FRANCE—G. Demartial
Romain Rolland
GERMANY—Theodor Hahn
INDIA—Rabindranath Tagore
ITALY—Guglielmo Lusidi
JAPAN—Nobuichiro Imaoha
RUSSIA—Afina Huebach

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, January 12, 1899, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

UNITY

A Journal of Religion in Democracy

UNITY was the first American paper to discover Gandhi, of India. When the great Mahatma was unknown even to newspapers, UNITY hailed him as "the greatest man in the world." Its files contain the most complete record of Gandhi and his work that exists in this country, and are continuing this record of original documents, special articles, editorial comments regularly. It is now publishing his Autobiography in weekly installments.

UNITY was the first American paper to espouse and advocate the Outlawry of War, that remarkable peace program that is sweeping the world. Its files are and will continue to be the most complete record in America of the progress of this cause.

UNITY has for more than forty years championed the idea of universal religion which finds in freedom the secret of unity and brotherhood, and it is today the outstanding organ of this opinion in this country.

UNITY is a weekly paper, sixteen pages, containing timely editorial comment, special articles, foreign correspondence by its own representatives in Europe and Asia, book reviews, and regular reports of news from the field of liberal thought and action.

CAN YOU GET ALONG WITHOUT IT?

WE THINK NOT!

Send for sample copies.

700 Oakwood Boulevard - - CHICAGO

$3.00 per year

Contents

EDITORIAL— Page

Notes 339
A Pioneer of Jeffersonian Democracy—REV. CHARLES F. DOLE 341
Jottings.—J. H. H. 343
Editorial Correspondence: American Notes—REV. SYDNEY STRONG 343

ARTICLES—

The Key—*John Dewey* 339
The Story of My Experiments with Truth—Chapter XVI—Changes—M. K. GANDHI 345
A Visit to Gandhi—*Max Wardall* 346
The Challenge of the Godless Saint—JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE 347

THE STUDY TABLE—

A Truthful Booklet of World History—DAVID STARR JORDAN 349
Ethical Culture—J. H. H. 350

CORRESPONDENCE—

From the Atlantic Monthly—ELLERY SEDGWICK 350
Senator Frazier's Resolution—VAUGHAN BACHMAN BROKAW 350

THE FIELD

General Conference of Fellowship of Reconciliation and Notes from Monthly News Sheet 351

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOLUME XCIX MONDAY, JULY 26, 1926 NUMBER 22

THE KEY

The community's duty to education is its paramount moral duty. By law and punishment society can regulate and form itself in a haphazard and chance way. Through education society can formulate its own purposes, can organize its own means and resources, and can shape itself with definiteness and economy.

It is the business of every one interested in education to insist upon the school as the primary and most effective interest of social progress. The art of giving shape to human powers is the supreme art.

—John Dewey.

It is very seldom that we find ourselves in agreement with Nicholas Murray Butler, President of Columbia, but we certainly agree with his statement in his Independence Day address before the American Society in London, that the Declaration of Independence is to be attributed more directly to the influence of Thomas Paine than to that of any other one man. Said President Butler, to quote his exact words:

> If the Declaration of Independence can be said to have had a single proximate and moving cause, that proximate and moving cause was Thomas Paine's pamphlet, "Common Sense."

John Adams recognized this fact when he said that "history will ascribe the American Revolution to Thomas Paine." His son, John Quincy Adams, made the same confession when he declared that " 'Common Sense' was the first factor in bringing about the Revolution." But this truth has in course of time been largely obscured by the insane prejudice which was stirred even in Paine's lifetime by his alleged atheism as set forth in his "Age of Reason," and which has continued almost unabated to the present hour. President Butler's frank statement is only one of many signs, however, that justice in this matter, though belated, is at last to be done. American independence, of course, had its roots deep in the soil of the past. President Coolidge was right when he said in his Philadelphia address that the religious experience of two hundred years went directly into its making. The political thought of Englishmen like John Locke, the philosophical revolt of the French Encyclopaedists, made their impressive contribution. But independence, as set forth in the immortal Declaration, came when it did, and was what it was, primarily because Paine's pen, touched with the fire of prophetic genius, enkindled American hearts with the passionate convictions of liberty and equality which had become the passion of his life. In Independence Hall, Philadelphia, there stands a bust of Paine in memory of his service to the national cause. We hope to live to see the time when a great monument will be reared in Washington, that all the world may see and learn that to this man, more than to any other, America owes the initiation of its independence as a nation.

The march of the 20,000 mutilated veterans in Paris on July 11th was a spectacle to touch the heart. If anything could persuade to a remission of the French debt, this were it. Nobody wants to tax these men for money—these, or the millions whom they represent. But there is another factor involved here. In this, as in every other such case, alas, there is the question of government as well as people. Get the French government, the political state, the few men who control political and economic power, well out of the way, and we could do things for the reconciliation of nations and the healing of wounds! But so long as France and not the French people is in the saddle, not even an appeal of the mutilated can save the situation. If France wants relief from her war-debt to this country, let her do three things, as pledge of faith for the future: (1) *Let France confess her share of guilt for the War, and ask forgiveness of mankind.* Still does France assume that in 1914 she was an innocent nation set upon by ruthless conquerors, and that her battle was therefore a battle in defense of civilization and democracy. All this is "tommy-rot"! We know today that, next only to her ally, Russia, France was herself responsible for the War and thus the maker of her own misery, and the ruin of all Europe. Let her confess her sin, and ask forgiveness. (2) *Let France forgive Germany, on the principle that her own trespasses can be forgiven only as she forgives those who trespass against herself, and let her prove her forgiveness of Germany by cancelling the Versailles Treaty.* So long as France insists upon maintaining this Treaty—extorted from a helpless victim by the power of the sword, she can expect no mercy, however sorely she may need it. It is ever the merciful who themselves obtain mercy. (3) Lastly, *let France abandon her militarism—withdraw from her savage and bloody conquests in Morocco and Syria—lead,*

as she alone can lead, in the campaign for disarmament. If her debt were lifted today, France would simply use the money thus released to strengthen her arms and thus to dominate the world by force. What we need from France are "the fruits of penitence." Till these appear, her veterans will march, as they fought and bled—in vain!

It didn't need a book from Clemenceau's aged pen to teach us that this man has no use for democracy. Our minds have no difficulty in going back a few years to a certain so-called Peace Conference at Versailles, held to bring to an end a certain war fought "to make the world safe for democracy." At one end of the peace table sat a man, Woodrow Wilson, who had taught the world to believe that this vast conflict was really a war for freedom. This man himself believed in democracy. "I believe in the ordinary man," was the first article of his political creed. "The select classes of mankind," he said, "are no longer the governors of mankind. The fortunes of mankind are now in the hands of the plain people of the world. . . . The countries belong to the people who live in them. . . . Every people has the right to determine its own form of government." It was in these convictions, and to establish these principles that Wilson went to Paris, that the soldiers of France as well as of America might not have died in vain. At the other end of the peace table sat another man, his savage hands hidden in his soft silk gloves as the claws of a tiger are hidden in his velvet paws. This man, the great Clemenceau, was cynical, cruel, autocratic, and powerful. He had acquiesced in President Wilson's pledge of the Allied cause to democracy, but he had never believed in it any more than he believed in the Ten Commandments, and when he sat down at that conference table he had but the one purpose of setting up a military tyranny which would destroy Germany and dominate Europe forever. If this meant a violation of solemn pledges, a breaking of the plighted word, a betrayal of the people, and an ending of the dream of peace, what of it; these were but the silly fantasies of moon-struck idealists who knew not how to govern. Such was Clemenceau at Versailles! More than any other one influence, he defeated Wilson, dictated the Punic peace of 1919, and thus prepared the way for the dictators who now mount triumphant on the ruins of European democracy. And now this man has the impudence to declare that democracy is a failure! Having committed murder, he mutilates and defiles the corpse. It is in the presence of such a man that we discover the limits of our charity and goodwill.

The *Literary Digest* has done a great public service in destroying the familiar lie that college drinking has increased since the passage of the 18th Amendment, and that Prohibition is therefore ruining our college youth. Interested in this damaging charge of the "wets," the *Digest* sent out a questionnaire to the heads of all the universities and higher institutions of learning in the country, asking them whether drinking among students had increased or decreased since Prohibition. The heads of 213 colleges in 44 states replied, and the consensus of opinion was that "drinking by the younger generation, or at least that portion of it in college, was decreasing." This confirms the impressive testimony given before the Senate committee this past winter by Professor Irving Fisher, of Yale. It confirms as well the memory and knowledge of every college graduate who is honest with himself and with the world on this question. We were in college a full quarter of a century ago (alas, alack!). We know what the drinking habits of the students were in those days—what went on after a football victory, what happened on Saturday nights, what was the regular practice of the day. We belonged, in our undergraduate period, to a fraternity of exceptionally high-grade character; the members were prevailingly men of scholarly interests and attainments. Yet this fraternity had its "bar," ale and beer were consumed in copious quantities, and in our senior year, as we remember, there was only one other man besides ourself who didn't drink. Anybody who knows conditions as they were yesterday and as they are today, knows that there has been an enormous improvement in our colleges since Prohibition came into effect. There was a time, a year or so after the Amendment was passed, when conditions were pretty bad—it was the "smart" thing for the student to imbibe! Today, however, college sentiment, whatever it thinks about the question in general, is frowning upon the man who disgraces his college by breaking the laws. It is as shameful now, as it used to be "smart," to get drunk. Of course, drinking continues, *but largely with the encouragement and under the example of parents at home!* Let these parents work with instead of against the colleges, and drinking among the students would disappear in a year.

Rudyard Kipling started a fascinating literary controversy when he referred to the twelve men who had achieved immortality in the field of literature in the last 2,500 years. Who are the divine twelve? Speculation is rife; and we must add our guess to the others offered, for we can never keep out of a discussion of this kind. First of all, in seeking answer to the question, we must establish some limitations. Thus, we shall follow President Eliot's example, when he lined up his five-foot shelf, of excluding the Bible. This and other "sacred literatures" are literatures all right, but in so specialized a sense that we are certain Kipling

could not have had them in mind. Secondly, we shall name no author of the last one hundred years, for a longer time than this is needed to guarantee such immortality as Kipling must have had in mind. Tolstoi, for example, would seem to be a sure candidate, but he is still a "candidate"; election to the role of the immortals is not yet! With these limitations established, we start our list, and begin of course with the Greeks. Here we find no less than four of the immortals—AESCHYLUS, SOPHOCLES, EURIPIDES, and PLATO. Rome offers at least two names, Virgil and Horace, but we select only one, VIRGIL, for Horace seems not to us to have attained the highest realms of literature. Down through the Middle Ages we come to our sixth immortal—DANTE. To him we add CERVANTES, whose "Don Quixote" has as permanent a place in the world's remembrance as "The Divine Comedy." Then, of course, SHAKESPEARE; and after him, MILTON. Our tenth name is VOLTAIRE, the most influential writer who ever lived. The next, as surely, is the transcendent GOETHE. And last comes SCOTT, as preeminent in the field of fiction as Shakespeare in the field of poetry and the drama. This is our list of the immortal twelve. Who would change it?—who would add, and take away? Let us hear from our readers!

A Pioneer of Jeffersonian Democracy

Does any one think of the American system of democratic government as a very wonderful discovery of the human intelligence? On the contrary, like all the greatest things in man's development, the democratic idea is one of the simplest and most natural steps upward. The children in their sports, especially the boys in their gangs or comradeships, the early tribal peoples, easily and almost necessarily tend to fall into appropriate democratic organizations. The other kinds of government, namely, artistocracies, monarchies and even tyrannies, exist upon a more or less democratic agreement of the underlying democracy. How long can a Mussolini last, unless upon the whole a pretty strong public opinion supports him? And a stream of public opinion constitutes at least one of the voices of the people, ofttimes more effective than a plebiscite.

The beginnings of democracy, that is, of the rule of the people, are seen wherever people are. Grant a root of common-sense in men; grant a bit of social regard for one another; grant a quite universal feeling about justice, and the rudimentary notion of a certain kind of equality among men out of which the majestic ideal of the Golden Rule blossoms, and you have the substantial spiritual qualities that will bring democracy into play.

What is democracy worth, however, unless it can provide for itself its appropriate leadership, its judges like Moses, its occasional savior-princes like Marcus Aurelius or King Arthur, true lovers of the people, its Washington and Lincoln, and especially its thinkers, students, and prophets like Franklin or Thomas Jefferson, whose work has been to bring the vital facts of democracy into our general consciousness, to translate its principles into working rules for our continual guidance and especially to determine and publish, to watch over and protect the rights of individuals and minorities? For individuals and minorities provide the vitamines without whose action a democracy presently falls into blind slavery to its baser, more ignorant, and unscrupulous elements. Moreover, these vitamin-ized individuals, men and women, though doubtless too often cranky and egotistic, but at their best and normally, zealous for the triumph of social principles and devoted to the public good, always furnish the teachers and also the martyrs of each new generation, holding as the ideal aim of their lives the highest development and fullest individualization of all men their brothers, and the coming of the better time long heralded by the seers, when the good spirit of humanity "shall be poured out upon all," and *all* men shall enter into the realization of the prophet's visions. So rich in its content, as well as obvious in its simplicity is the ideal democracy.

Now it is interesting to observe in every line of human science, so far as we know, that after the great names of the proclaimed inventors, or discoverers, or geniuses appear, we presently catch the dim figures of their forerunners—men almost unknown, busy at work and actually finding the secrets of the knowledge, or the wisdom for unfolding which the later seekers got the rewards and the fame. Never, the one person alone, but a cluster of the unrecognized lives; never the famous men without the invisible urgency of comrades unknown for whom no monuments were ever raised. Do you call this pathetic? Do you deem that all these unknown soldiers of truth were wasted? No, we call this glorious. Here were men who wrote noble and comforting verses: "The Lord is my shepherd"; here was the man who first said: "What doth the Lord require of thee, but to deal justly and love mercy and walk humbly!" We know nothing whatever about him. Is any great man doing more utterly the work of civilizing the world than such as these grand though unknown people were doing?

We say all this about the nature of democracy in order to make a bit of framing in which to set an almost forgotten American who pioneered sturdidly a full lifetime before Jefferson for the cause of democratic government. This man was John Wise, the Congregational minister of the town church of Ipswich,

Massachusetts from 1683; he died in 1725. He had been graduated at Harvard College in 1673. The inscription over his grave says: "For Talents, Piety, and Learning, he shone as a star of the first magnitude."

John Wise came to manhood under the lowering political sky of Sir Edmund Andros' governorship. When in 1687 Andros assessed a new and odious tax upon the colonists, Wise led a meeting of his parishioners and fellow citizens who agreed to offer "passive resistance," for which offense he and five others were sent to Boston jail. Wise was later put under bonds for a thousand pounds and suspended from his office. Andros was expelled in the following year, when the Stuart autocrats were driven from England.

In 1705 the Boston ministers proposed what seemed doubtless very slight and innocent innovations from the Simon-pure Congregationalism of the New England churches. The step led straight toward Presbyterianism. John Wise's keen eye saw immediately the undemocratic tending of "the sixteen proposals" and he promptly spoke and wrote against them. Out of this discussion came the remarkable little book: "Vindication of the Government of New England Churches," of which a special edition was made in 1772. The names of the subscribers read like a roll of honor of the public spirited citizens of Massachusetts of that date. It is said that some of the most striking sentences of the Declaration of Independence are almost literal quotations from this little book. Bancroft's History sums up Wise's central proposition in his own words: *"Democracy is Christ's Government in Church and State."*

In other words, democracy is the expression of the essential religious nature of man, or the manifestation everywhere in our social life, in homes, in neighborhoods, in work and economics, and especially in politics (that is, in the orderly governance of the town or the commonwealth), of "the life of God in the souls of men." The life of God is Good Will. Where Good Will is, and so far as it prevails, democracy is the result. We hope that we are coming to see this more clearly than ever John Wise or Jefferson saw it, but Wise certainly apprehended the main lines of this wonderful spiritual vision.

Wise drew his arguments from certain fundamental principles, as sound and commanding as any facts in the realm of science. He apprehended what every scientific thinker always does and must, that behind and above all phenomena is that mystery which we call reason. He was extremely fond of speaking of "the light of Reason." Men can do or say nothing against reason. The test of all true thinking is in the appeal to reason. Let democracy, and the institutions and rules that it establishes, conform to good reason (might we not say, common sense?) and it will shine out in its excellence.

This remarkable faith in the reason resident in man has never been too common, or confident enough at any time. How could Wise be so sure of it, bound as he was by the destructive Calvinist teaching regarding the ruined state of all the sons of Adam? Now, it is interesting to observe that where his Calvinism collides with his reason, he steers his way by reason. Reason was in his esteem a means of revelation. He is pleased to note that man is not altogether ruined by sin, but has in himself ever so much that is good. We suspect that he was well on the way towards the heresies of "modernism." How can the man who carries an open mind and makes constant appeal to our common sense be seriously impeded? Wise loves to speak of "the glory of man" even in his imperfect state. It is his glory to recognize light and truth.

Another essential foundation of sound democracy lies in the native equality of men. Have they not a common origin? He means by equality what Shakespeare's Jew says so persuasively in "The Merchant of Venice." He does not mean that men do not differ in values. But they all have marvelous qualities by virtue of which they are accounted human. Here is another essentially religious piece of ground work. The qualities which constitute humanity are spiritual and ideal. The community of men's natures to whatever race they belong, lies in substances and values which no instrument can detect or measure, and yet without which *human* life would cease to be. Here is their equality. Here is the beginning of a notion of government, which already has put an end to slavery, and must absolutely destroy war. Here is that which forbids any class of privileged folk over against a disfranchised proletariat in church or state. In this faith will come the fall of all oligarchies, or Houses of Lords, or superior castes, erected out of pride of family, or wealth or "culture."

It follows that the peculiar mark of democracy is its respect in each one for the values, worth and dignity of every other—of children preeminently, but necessarily also for the ignorant and even the wayward and froward. Who are you and I that we should exalt ourselves to display our scorn, impatience, vexation, bitterness or hate towards any of the members of the great commonwealth of mankind?

It is not surprising that John Wise is cloudy in some of his processes. How could any one see the wealth of practical suggestiveness that lay in this newly discovered query of thought? Eager as he was to protect the rights of minorities, he could see nothing more satisfactory for that purpose than the clumsy machinery of a voting majority! We wonder whether he knew the best Quaker thought and practice? Again, as before, we must urge that in no ingenious mechan-

ism or manual of rules of proceeding, or even Bills of Right and Constitutions, can you ever confine or express valid democracy in the absence of the guiding spirit, the open mind, faith in the power of kindly persuasion, and patient respect for those from whom you differ.

John Wise lived in a rude world; his generation was possessed with tough prejudices concerning the prestige and functions of rulers and elders, concerning the use of violence and cruel punishments, concerning the necessity of war wherewith to advance the ends of government and enforce the will of the king in the multitude. Who in New England preached a thoroughgoing gospel about the Almighty Ruler? He was a God of wrath. He had infinite punishments in store for rebellious subjects. How could the men of such a time conceive of the overwhelming promise of a reign of perfect good-will for all? A hearty and all-round democracy was not yet possible, and still waits to be realized, only when the ways of violence, fear and distrust become odious and preposterous to the men of good will.

Finally, we can hardly help drawing a comparison between the two great men, John Wise and his quite near contemporary, Jonathan Edwards. One was a practical philosopher in the realm of civilized politics, the actual fruit of whose work was a new kind of state. The other was a metaphysical philosopher the end of whose most famous work is a sort of *reductio ad absurdum* of the idea of a divine Universe. What a tragic business for the kindly missionary to the Stockbridge Indians! CHARLES F. DOLE.

Jottings

In justice to Mr. Ellery Sedgwick and the *Atlantic Monthly,* we ask the attention of our readers to the letter in our "Correspondence" column denying the report, printed in this place on June 28th last, that the *Atlantic Monthly* has been purchased by the Hearst interests.

"There is far more danger of harm than there is hope of good in any radical changes." This is what Calvin Coolidge said in his address at Philadelphia in celebration of the 150th anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence. We wonder where this country would be today if this had been the sentiment of Washington, Jefferson, Franklin and their compatriots in 1776.

The measures adopted by the Mexican Government in its fight for the disestablishment of the Catholic Church may be "illegal, unjust and inhuman," as the Holy See charges. We do not know! But we *do* know that this battle of the Mexicans is the battle fought by all free nations since the Reformation, and we wish them victory.

"There has been injustice in the world for a long time, but Sinclair (Upton) discovered it only yesterday."—George P. West, in the *American Mercury.*

This is the kind of flippancy which makes us terribly tired. How could Upton Sinclair have discovered the injustice in the world earlier than yesterday when he was born only yesterday? And what better thing can any man do than expose and condemn this injustice as soon as he discovers it, whenever this may be?

Shakespeare says that there is "good in everything." We have sometimes doubted this, but we believe it now when we discover that there is good even in Mussolini's government of Italy. Thus, the Dictator has just issued an order forbidding all cabinet ministers to hire any more employees. He hopes thus to end the growing army of office-seekers and job-hunters. Good work!

This department will be suspended during the next two months. Publication will be resumed on October 4th next. J. H. H.

American Notes

[Editorial Correspondence]

I

I met two very interesting men only yesterday, one who originally hailed from the continent of Africa, the other coming direct from China. In fact, I had the pleasure of introducing them to each other. As a result, they will have a talk as they roll over the continent in a Pullman. Something good for the future of the world may come out of their meeting, for both are leaders among men, one in China, the other among the Negroes of America. William Pickens, the Negro, I heard speak several times. He is an unusual orator. Seldom does any one hear better. H. H. Kung, the Chinese, was on his way to Oberlin College, where he graduated just twenty years ago. He was going to receive an honorary degree. He had a Master's degree from Yale in 1907. Kung is head of Shansi College, China. The story of Pickens life rivals in human interest that of Booker T. Washington—along side of whom he must be placed in naming Negro leaders. I heard him speak before a Democratic Club, saying playfully that a Negro didn't often have the

opportunity of "meeting members of the Democratic Party—unless it might be at a lynching party." The reporters who heard him became so absorbed that they were nearly unable to take down his words. This was Pickens "the Yale man" who had worked his way through, and swept away all opposition in a noted oratorical contest, the man who became a great teacher in Talladega, later Dean of Morgan college, and now for five years the Field Secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, with headquarters at 69 Fifth Ave., New York City.

It was interesting to listen to his oratory. Like Roland Hayes, he might not be able to put up at the majority of the hotels, but he was literally able to make his white hearers eat out of his hands, so compelling is his power. I recall a bit of his address, impromptu and suggested by a solo just preceding his remarks, on music. "People ask why the colored people can sing." (Here he gave a fine description of the power of music, as a unifier and inspirer.) "Two animals only sing. Birds and men. The birds have wings. This accounts for their song. They can take to the air, while the ground-animals are filled with care and forebodings and must fight it out with claw and tooth. And the Negro, why has he learned to sing? I do not claim for him wings, but when the slave was through with his work, he had nothing to do and was free from care, and so he could sing." Whether this is correct or not, did not so much matter, for in Pickens we could see those wonderful and melodious hymns of the Negro that are inimitable. And as he unrolled the facts as to the progress of the colored people since Emancipation, standing before us as living proof of his declaration, the peer of any one in the room, it was very plain that the American Negro had not only arrived, but he was fitted to play an important part in the building of the Western Republic, that it would be best for all if segregation were eliminated and he were encouraged to play his part freely and naturally.

And Dr. H. H. Kung, the educator from China, was going on to Oberlin College to gather fresh laurels. I quickly discovered that he was something more than an educator. He knew the politics of China. He was personally acquainted with the three leading military men of his country. More, he had filled diplomatic positions. He had well-grounded opinions, and was not reticent to express them. He is the head of a Christian college. He knows thoroughly the ethics, according to which Westerners profess to be governed. He will tell you frankly, that he expects Feng—the "Christian" general—to come to the front in Chinese life. Just as frankly he will tell you where the foreigners (including Americans) come in. Foreigners are the cause of China's troubles, he says. They provoke trouble. The Japanese work the most on the political end of it, the British on the financial end of it. Both, each in his own way, seek to dominate the activities of China. The Americans?—Well, they have been well regarded, until lately, and now they cooperate with Japanese and British in holding China under domination. The Chinese like the Russians, because the Russians are friendly, not because of bolshevism. The Chinese, he said, will not rest until foreign domination, political, financial is completely broken. "We are not against foreigners, in their proper place. We welcome them to China, but not to dominate, to kill us. We ask only what every first-class people is entitled to have, the right to govern ourselves. We mean to have it."

Kung and Pickens represent two tremendous human forces which America will be compelled seriously and justly to consider. Both Kung and Pickens think that understanding on the part of white Americans is essential. Pickens is sure, and proves it, that the Negro knows the whites better than the whites know the Negro, for the Negro has free access to the white man's house, from the cellar to the garret, and to the best houses. The white man rarely sees a Negro's home, unless he goes slumming or on health inspection. A dominating class rarely understands a minority group, but mutual understanding is essential to a Republic's existence. Both Kung and Pickens come bearing gifts of patience, good will, intelligence and character to the Republic. How will they be received? Upon that depends much of the future welfare of mankind.

II

It must be admitted that much of American life partakes of the jazz-spirit. One can turn to hardly any realm without discovering it. In religion, e. g., one finds what may be described as "Billy-Sundayism." It is a long way (down, I think) from Finney and Moody to Billy Sunday. This last kind of evangelism is, however, fading away, either giving way for something worse or because the people are weary of religious sensation. In literature, one discovers jazz in Lewis and Mencken. It's a long way (down, I think) from Lowell, Mark Twain, Whitman, Hawthorne to these popular writers. It is possible that the Negro, who created jazz, may also save literature. In the "Charleston" one gets the dance set in jazz. There is a little evidence, as in Europe, that a return to simpler forms of the dance is on the way.

One must remember, however, that there are depths in American life that are quite contrary to the jazz spirit. . . . Here are the words of an educator, spoken in our community, by Dr. Robert A. Millikan, well known scientist, director of physics in California Institute of Technology. He was speaking of religion, the development of which he traced through its various stages, beginning with pagan and barbaric forms of worship, on through the coming of Jesus, with a backward movement following, in which religion became encrusted with superstition, through which the life of Jesus had to shine. . . . An utterly new conception of God came to man with the increase of scientific knowledge, with limitless possibilities ahead. . . . "Religion," he said, "was of two sorts: first the dogmatic type, which may be farther divided into atheism and fundamentalism, and liberal religion, which in contrast to the others was that which kept the mind open and was capable of adapting itself to an ever-changing world. . . . Modern science walks humbly with the Lord, its God."

SYDNEY STRONG.

THE UPWARD LOOK

All of our lookings into the world that seems
Are downward, tho we catch the stars in flight:
Only our inward looking toward the dreams
Is a look upward toward the Lord of Light.

Nautilus. —*Edwin Markham.*

The Story of My Experiments with Truth

[The Autobiography of Mahatma Gandhi]

(Copyrighted, 1926)

CHAPTER XVI

Changes

Let no one imagine that my experiments in dancing and the like marked a stage of indulgence in my life. The reader will have noticed that even then I had my wits about me. That period of infatuation was not unrelieved by a certain amount of self-examination on my part. I kept account of every farthing I spent, and my expenses were carefully calculated. Every little item, such as omnibus fares or postage or a couple of coppers spent on newspapers, would be entered, and the balance struck every evening before going to bed. That habit has stayed with me ever since, and I know that as a result, though I have had to handle public funds amounting to lakhs, I have succeeded in exercising strict economy in their disbursement, and instead of outstanding debts have had invariably a surplus balance in respect of all the movements I have led. Let every youth take a leaf out of my book and make it a point to account for everything that comes into and goes out of his pocket, and like me he is sure to be a gainer in the end.

As I kept strict watch over my way of living, I could see that it was necessary to cut my coat according to my cloth. I therefore decided to reduce my expenses by half. My accounts showed numerous items spent on fares. Again, my living with a family meant the payment of a regular weekly bill. It also included the courtesy of occasionally taking members of the family out to dinner; and also attending parties with them. All this involved heavy items for conveyances, especially as, if the friend was a lady, custom required that men should pay all the expenses. Also dining out meant extra cost as no deduction could be made from the regular weekly bill for meals not taken. It seemed to me that all these items could be saved; as likewise the drain on my purse caused through a false sense of propriety.

So I decided to take rooms on my own account, instead of living any longer in a family, and also to move from place to place according to the work I had to do, thus gaining experience at the same time. The rooms were so selected as to enable me to reach the place of business on foot in half an hour, and so save fares. Before this I had always taken some kind of conveyance whenever I went anywhere, and had to find extra time for walks. The new arrangement combined walks and economy, as it meant a saving of fares and gave me walks of eight to ten miles a day. It was mainly this habit of long walks that kept me practically free from illness throughout my stay in England and gave me a fairly strong body.

Thus then I rented a suite of rooms; one for a sitting room and another for a bedroom. This was the second stage. The third was yet to come.

These changes saved me half the expense. But how was I to utilize the time? I knew that Bar examinations did not require much study, and I therefore did not feel pressed for time. My weak English was a perpetual worry to me. Mr. (afterwards Sir Frederic) Lely's words "Graduate first and then come to me," still rang in my ears. I should, I thought, not only be called to the Bar, but have some literary degree as well. I inquired about Oxford and Cambridge University courses, consulted a few friends and found that if I elected to go to either of these places they would bring me in for a lot of expense and a much longer stay than I was prepared for. A friend suggested that if I really wanted to have the satisfaction of taking a difficult examination, I should pass the London Matriculation. It meant a good deal of labor and much addition to my stock of general knowledge, without any extra expense worth the name. I welcomed the suggestion. But the syllabus frightened me. Latin and a modern language were compulsory! How was I to manage Latin? But the friend entered a strong plea for it: "Latin is very valuable to lawyers. Knowledge of Latin is very useful in understanding lawbooks. And one paper in Roman law is entirely in Latin. Besides, a knowledge of Latin means greater command over the English language." It went home and I decided to learn Latin, no matter how difficult it might be. French I had already begun, so I thought that should be the modern language. I joined a private Matriculation class. Examinations were held every six months and I had only five months at my disposal. It was an almost impossible task for me. But the aspirant after being an English gentleman chose to convert himself into a serious student. I framed my own time table to the exact minute; but neither my intelligence nor memory promised to enable me to reach Latin and French besides other subjects within the given period. The result was that I was ploughed in Latin. I was sorry but I did not lose heart. I had acquired a taste for Latin, also I thought my French would be all the better for another trial and that I would select a new subject in the science group. Chemistry, which was my subject in science, had no attraction for want of experiments, whereas it should be a deeply interesting study. It was one of the compulsory subjects in India and so I had selected it for the London Matriculation. This time, however, I chose "Heat and Light" instead of Chemistry. It was said to be easy and I found it so.

With my preparation for another trial, I made an effort to simplify my life still further. I felt that my way of living did not yet become the modest means of my family. The thought of my struggling brother, who nobly responded to my regular calls deeply pained me. I saw that most of those who were spending from eight to fifteen pounds monthly had the advantage of scholarships. I had before me examples of much simpler living. I came across a fair number of poor students living more humbly than I. One of them was staying in the slums in a room at two shillings a week and living on two pence worth of cocoa and bread per meal from Lockhart's cheap Cocoa Rooms. It was far from me to think of emulating him, but I felt I could surely have one room instead of two and cook some of my meals at home. That would be a saving of four to five pounds each month. I also came across books on simple living. I gave up the suite of rooms and rented one instead, invested in a stove, and began cooking my breakfast at home. The process scarcely took me more than twenty

minutes for there was only oat-meal porridge to cook and water to boil for cocoa. I had lunch out and for dinner had bread and cocoa at home. Thus I managed to live on a shilling and three pence a day. This was also a period of intensive study. Plain living saved me plenty of time and I passed my examination.

Let not the reader think that this living made my life by any means a dreary affair. On the contrary, the change harmonized my inward and outward life. It was also more in keeping with the means of my family. My life was certainly more truthful and my soul knew no bounds of joy.

M. K. GANDHI.

(*Translated from Navajivan by Mahadeo Desai*)

A Visit to Gandhi

It is a mistake to suppose that Mahatma Gandhi is an historical "has-been," an evolutionary discard. It is a mistake to assume, that because the non-cooperative movement fostered by him failed in its operation,* that Mohandus Karamchand Gandhi has ceased to be a factor in the political, moral, spiritual life of India.

It was exactly because everywhere throughout the length and breadth of India his name still reverberates with such curious insistence that I determined to discover why this man, who had been discredited by his followers, defeated by his enemies, deserted by his friends, still remains such a vital force in the life of India.

So, after months of wandering from the Vales of Cashmere to the Jungles of Ceylon, from the Arabian Sea to the Bay of Bengal, I approached at last the city of my pilgrimage—Ahmedabad—where Gandhi, the Indian Saint, resides.

Ahmedabad, in a sense, is a very bad setting for a saint, for it is not, like Benares, a city of culture and holiness; it has not the perfume of sanctity that surrounds the city of Gya, where Lord Buddha received his illumination; it is not filled with fairy tombs and mosques like Agra; it has no fascinating ruins or ancient traditions. On the contrary, Ahmedabad, is young, dirty, sordid and commercial. It does not remotely suggest a place of peace or contemplation, or the home of the mystic or devotee. It suggests heat and flies and vaguely sequestered filth. So we drive hurriedly through the city and out across the Sabalmati River, then turn sharply to the right, and follow the winding river for three miles until we come to the Gandhi Ashram.

Here, in a small brick house on the bank of the river, we found Mahatma Gandhi. When we were ushered into his presence he was seated cross-legged on the floor, spinning on an old-fashioned loom. He arose when we entered, making the Indian salutation of joined hands on the breast, and then extended his right hand in Western greeting. He was dressed in loin cloth—nothing more; his stature is about five feet eight and a half inches, in proportion very meager, and his weight is only one hundred and two and a half pounds. Despite the proportions the spare body is not without dignity and some measure of grace. His head is large, high, and decidedly intellectual; it is not the head of a fanatic but that of a very good and a very obstinate man. There is a considerable width between the ears themselves, indicating ruthlessness, and the ears themselves, very large and exceedingly prominent, show a certain vigor and tenacity that one does not expect in so frail a person.

The nose is large and spreading, becoming rather depressed at the tip. A curious nose, at once flaring and recessive, creative yet unaspiring—a nose of vivid feeling, yet without a vestige of the aesthetic. The mouth is heavy with the lower lip drooping away with a curve from the teeth. It is a sympathetic face, with large brilliant eyes that speak of wide-spreading compassion. The chin is insignificant, and the hair, cropped close to the head, is gray and wiry. After his greeting he seated himself at the loom and continued his spinning. For an hour, we sat thus talking, accompanied only by the droning of the wheel and the flitting of the birds in the mango trees outside.

"Have you any hope that America can or will help in the uplift of India?" I asked. The soft Indian voice speaking in pure English with scarcely an accent, replied, "It is through the sympathy and understanding of America and the other great nations that we Indians gain the moral force to make our sacrifices."

"What message shall I take to America from you?" The brilliant eyes flashed up from the wheel as he said, "Light—more light*—that is my message. America must know the truth about India—not newspaper truths that give wrong views of the right, but right truths from the lips of those who are dedicated to liberty and truth."

"Will you not come to America some day?" I asked.

"Yes, that is my intention," he replied, "but at present I am not in a position to do so—much work presses for completion, and many problems seek solution. Here, too, at the Gandhi Ashram we are preparing many people for service. There are two hundred on the place. The majority of them are under discipline. They are dedicated as few people have the courage to be dedicated."

"What is the nature of their discipline?" I inquired.

"They are pledged to poverty, chastity, obedience, and harmlessness. They have thrown off the caste obession and accept all men as brothers, aye, even the pariah. They have renounced what we called untouchability and have agreed to live in brotherhood with all mankind. Each person weaves at least one-half hour each day. He dresses in rough homespun made from cloth woven on our own compound; he is paid nothing, accepts nothing, expects nothing, save a life of labor and service."

"Are these the future saviors of India?" I asked.

"That I cannot say," was the response, "but they will be the servants of India."

"Have you heard the message announced by Annie Besant that a World-Teacher is soon to appear, and will use the body of Krishnamurti, a Brahman youth, as a vehicle?"

"Yes, I have heard of it," he said with a faint

*It can hardly be said with accuracy that "the non-cooperative movement failed." It has undergone and is undergoing vicissitudes, but the movement is still of momentous importance.—J. H. H.

*The last words of Goethe.

smile and a shake of the heavy head. "But it does not interest me. Teachers and prophets have come to the world from time to time to give help to men, and I believe they will come again. The idea of the Coming I am prepared to accept, but that the Divine Teacher will use as a vehicle the body of this or that disciple—such a statement I am unable to verify, to affirm, or deny. And moreover," he said, "I am not in sympathy with the Theosophical Movement."

"You were once a Theosophist, were you not?" I asked.

"Yes," he replied. "When in South Africa I worked with Major Peacock in the building-up of the Theosophical Movement. I am still a Theosophist but I am not in sympathy with the Movement. I am not in favor of any institution which fosters secrecy. Any secret training or discipline like that practiced in the inner school of Theosophy offends my democratic sympathies. I want everything open and free to all. I have steadily advocated the leveling of all barriers between peoples of all classes."

As he sat there speaking in his quiet, cultured voice, turning the wheel with his right hand and spinning the cotton with his left, the heavy, patient, down-drooping head nodding rhythmically on the long thin neck, he seemed in some curious way to typify India and her multi-colored past. Something in the stubborn set of his shoulders spoke of her inconsistency, of her age, her glory, her long slavery, her unspeakable poverty, her amazing riches, her mysticism, her lavish devotion, her bewildering variety, and her strange intangible wisdom.

As I passed out of the cool shadows into India's sunshine I looked again into the eyes of this strange man of the East, and there I saw the gleam of sacrificial fires and knew why Gandhi had not been forgotten.

The Messenger (Official Organ, American Philosophical Society.)

—*Max Wardall.*

The Challenge of the Godless Saint

Standardized religion has always known how to deal with the "blatant infidel." The method has varied with the age, and the fashions approved by public sentiment. At one time, the fagot and the screw were thus approved. At others, devices of social ostracism have been scarcely less effective.

Successful suppression of religious dissent is approved by popular sentiment in its own age. Only later generations whiten the sepulchers of slain prophets. The apparent frequency of this belated whitening blinds the most of us to the actually meager minority of the "prophets" whose tombs have been preserved. For the one prophet who survives by the grace or caprice of succeeding generations, a thousand "prophets" are made away with by their own unbelieving generation, without hope of resurrection.

Usually what dooms these is some form of moral delinquency in themselves. Sometimes it is bestiality, uncontrolled animal passions. Sometimes it is self-conceit, a worship of self thinly cloaked by a worthier culture. Sometimes it is "blatency," which is perhaps only a particular type of self-conceit. The rebel who resorts to force is rendered helpless by the very method he uses to win his ends; a weak force attacking a powerful force simply invites the disaster which usually befalls. Only rarely does the true prophet appear whose purity of life and of purpose justifies his appeal to the arbitrament of generations not his own.

Bombast, self-conceit, reckless iconoclasm is ordinarily its own undoing. His own generation makes short work of the "prophet" who resorts to such devices, because the methods are themselves essentially futile. Such a "prophet" slays himself before he is slain by others.

This is why standardized religion has been able so summarily to deal with "atheism." A simple-minded Indian, who had been sedulously schooled in orthodox Christian doctrine after a prepared background of his native theology, once encountered a "blatant infidel." After listening to his tirade for a time, he remarked, "The Bible says, 'The fool hath said in his heart, "There is no God",' but you, great big fool, you blab it right out!" The "infidel" who is forever "blabbing," flaunting his opinions, commonly suffers the fate of all egotists. Orthodoxy finds him easy.

Doubtless orthodoxy has a right to its victory. Moral delinquency is fatal, and ought to be fatal. But for the most part the easy victory of orthodoxy blinds us to the real issue. May it not be that the discomfiture of many a "blatant infidel" comes of the immorality of blatancy rather than the error of atheism?

Thousands today, as they read the glowing periods of Robert G. Ingersoll's oratory, wonder how he could ever have been esteemed by multitudes of his own generation as a monster, a defamer of God, an outrageous "infidel." I have recently seen an autograph letter from him to a woman distraught by the death of a son. The tender manner in which he soothes her fears for his fate, and affords comfort and re-assurance, is wonderful. It seems incredible that religious leadership of his day could have so unanimously and bitterly denounced him.

The answer lies more in Ingersoll and his method than in the vindictiveness of his generation's standardized religion. Ingersoll baited orthodoxy. He scoffed and scorned. His platform manner was "blatant." When the orthodox preachers of his day charged him with being a "blatant infidel," they lodged against him a just indictment. They proved their charge. He was convicted of moral delinquency. But his accusers took too much assurance from their assumed triumph over atheism. Atheism was not disproved with the discomfiture of Ingersoll.

No sincere disbeliever in the doctrines of orthodox theology flaunts his opinions. Because he flaunts no opinions, least of all negative opinions, disbeliefs. The common sin of the radical is arrogance. His manner and spirit are fatal to him and his cause; he perishes and his cause, whose essential value gains no test from his advocacy, perishes with him, or at least awaits a worthier champion.

There is nothing in atheism, as pure negation, to enlist worthy championship. There are many atheists among American thinkers, but the propaganda of atheism is pitiful; it cannot claim any degree of popular respect, though the number of actual disbelievers in

the existence of a personal deity was probably never before so great in our society. A re-incarnation of Robert G. Ingersoll would be impossible today, though probably multitudes entertain substantially the same positive beliefs which he held.

It is easy to charge some of these "atheists" with duplicity. Too easy. Some of them retain the verbiage of theism with a sincerity which quite satisfies their own consciences. I listened with keen interest not long ago to a physical scientist who in making a popular presentation of his subject began and ended with glowing expressions of belief in God. Most of his audience, largely composed of more or less frequent attendants upon orthodox preaching, carried away a comfortable assurance that they could accept the wonders of modern science and retain at the same time the beliefs of their churches.

When the lecturer interpolated the remark that none of us can longer retain the anthropomorphic conceptions of deity which were once correct doctrine, they were even more assured of his and their own correctness, for they had heard the same statement again and again from their orthodox preachers. Most of them probably had only the vaguest idea of the meaning of such tongue-testing terms, but they found some satisfaction in being assured that a degree of latitudinarianism is consistent with correct beliefs.

It was easy for me to discover both from his public utterances and from back-stage conversation with him that the lecturer's conceptions of what he called God cannot be squared with the doctrines of any consistent theist. I chanced to be standing by when a bright newspaper reporter accosted the lecturer for an interview. His first question was, "Dr. Blank, do you say in your lecture that modern science demonstrates the existence of God because you really believe it, or because you do not want to get in wrong with the church people?"

The lecturer was considerably "fussed," and launched upon an explanation of his views which was manifestly prompted by a desire to remain loyal to his science and at the same time avoid the moral delinquency of "blatant infidelity." The true scientist realizes that atheism cannot be erected into a creed or a cult. Nobody of sound judgment chooses deliberately to go campaigning in the interests of a sheer negation.

It is morally reprehensible, doubtless, to dissemble, to pretend to believe what one does not believe, to mouth conventional verbiage in a radically new sense, with the deliberate intention of making the unthinking populace believe that you are using the old words in their old sense. But the "blabbing" atheist is both foolish and immoral, immoral because he is foolish. And few of the many atheists of today are of the foolish and wicked blabbing sort.

I do not attempt here to prove that these modern "atheists" are many; I take it for granted that the reader knows it. If he is not conscious of it he need only listen to the typical modern sermon, which shows that even liberal preachers are keenly conscious of the fact, and are joining with their fundamentalist fraternity in sounding alarm, and in vehement assertion of the validity and finality of theism.

Nor do I attempt to appraise the virtue of dissembling as over against "blabbing," or of "blabbing" as over against dissembling. Decision must doubtless be left to the conscience of the individual "atheist," as to whether he shall openly declare his disbelief in the doctrine of God, or shall protest his adherence to the doctrine and go on believing in an "impersonal deity."

The point of the most significant social concern is the challenge which these many modern thinkers and workers offer standardized religion.

Dr. Fosdick, no less ardently than Mr. Bryan, and with even more eloquence, has declared that religion dissipates and disappears in a disbelief in God. Atheism is the negation of religion, say they, not simply dissent from a particular doctrine which is current among certain religious groups. The mystic, Donald Hankey, under the spell of mingled torture and annihilation in the trenches of France, cried out, "Religion is betting one's life that there is a God." This remark has been quoted in innumerable sermons as a valid definition.

At the same time, official exponents and interpreters of religion, both fundamentalist and modernist, have insisted that religion is universal, that there is that inherent in humanity, something in the very making, which makes man a religious being.

All men are elementally religious, and religion is staking one's all on the existence of a God: that is the way the formulas run. Yet increasing numbers of highly intelligent, keenly social-minded (may we not properly say?), devoutly religious, citizens of our democracy are atheists, when catechized upon any definition of deity which these same official exponents and interpreters of religion will accept as valid.

This is the dilemma of modern religion. The issue is of a significance which pales into colorlessness the matters over which contending groups among religious leaders have worked up so great heat. Why show such concern over the homoousia and homoiousia of theology when the "science" of theology itself is the real issue. Not what kind of theology is valid, but is theology of any kind valid?

If the "infidelity" of today were blatant it would be immeasurably more manageable in the hands of standardized religious leaders and institutions. If its morality were open to attack, its heresy would be far more vulnerable. But the atheists of today are not blatant, at least there are many who are not. Their personal characters are above reproach. Their modesty is admirable. Their social passion is highly commendable. And their social efficiency is often superb.

These successfully meet all the tests of religion, except that they do not believe in a personal deity. That one lack, our official religious leaders almost unanimously declare, condemns them. This looks like more than a charge of heresy; it is rather a denial of fact. These "atheists" are splendid specimens of the human; they are profoundly and devoutly religious. Yet they are not religious, and cannot be, if our official religion is valid.

These Godless saints are forcing upon our society a redefinition of religion which disqualifies for their office virtually all of our recognized religious leaders. Unfrock us, virtually say they, not a few heretics among us, but all of us; abolish the churches, not those of certain heretical sects, but all of them; expunge from our vocabulary the verbiage, and from our minds the ideas of religion; if disbelief in God is religiously valid. For there can be no religion in that case, say they, and religious institutions and functionaries are a delusion and an unwarranted encumbrance upon society.

Yet all the time the numbers grow of those who shape our educational system, who conduct our great-

est scientific achievements, who organize our industrial enterprises, who humanize the arts in all departments, and who intelligently and with conscious purpose shape their course by creeds which do not include a belief in God, creeds which imply if they do not assert that for them a belief in a personal deity would be false and immoral.

We are all familiar with sectarian intolerance. There are whole religious orders who exalt a particular doctrine to a place which makes outcast and profane those who do not accept it. Immersion in water is still altogether essential to salvation, according to the creeds of some churches.

But there are numerous baptist churches who have yielded such views, and who support ministers ready to declare that immersion in water is optional, and entirely unessential to true religion. We have numerous churches who themselves hold tenaciously to particular doctrines, and maintain that they are essential to the highest religious standards, but who still allow more or less worthy religious standing to those who hold to different if not contradictory doctrines.

But where is the church which welcomes atheists, or will even admit them to fellowship? This will, it would seem, become more and more a test question in religious circles. What shall standardized religion do with those who cannot sincerely declare belief in the existence of God? Liberal churches are joining with orthodox in shutting them out of all religious fellowship.

Would any one seriously invite them to build churches of their own, founded upon pure negation? Such a resort would compromise the proposer's sincerity. Of course these "atheists" will do no such thing. If they cherished the vice of blatancy, and there were enough of them, that is precisely what they would do, thus condemning themselves and saving the face of religious regularity. But that is what they will not do. Religious regularity cannot therefore save its face by their folly. How, then, will it save its face?

Here are increasing numbers of citizens, including many of our best spirits and most wholesome social energies, who know themselves to be religious beings, and who are deriving profound satisfaction from activities and aspirations which they declare to be religious, but whom all of our churches, liberal as well as "evangelical," modernist as well as fundamentalist, categorically exclude from fellowship, and that by virtue of a negation. They cannot form a religious fellowship of their own, because to do so would involve the display of a vice which they do not have and will not cultivate. They are religious outcasts simply because they will not believe a certain doctrine. They do not presume to exploit a doctrine of their own; they do not even deny for others the doctrine in question. They simply do not believe it. And all the religious bodies of the land shut them out, or permit them entrance only as they dissemble, or use terms out of their historic meaning, and in a sense which the churches to which they apply officially and vehemently repudiate.

This situation presents the sternest challenge which our institutions of religion now face. Our denominational system allows each religious body to "pass the buck" to a sister denomination. Each says, "If you do not like our creed, go elsewhere, and find a church whose creed you do like." But when all unite in a process of exclusion which leaves increasing numbers of our most valuable social elements out of all, permanently debarred from religious fellowship, all must come under indictment.

How standardized religion will meet this issue would seem the most interesting and vital religious question of the present, and certainly of the early future.

JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE.

New York City.

The Study Table

A Truthful Booklet of World History

A remarkable little book* on the Universal History of Civilization, for the use of school children of every country, has just been published in French by the Society for International Conciliation, founded by the late D'Estournelles de Constant.

The booklet is by Dr. Charles Richet, professor in the University of Paris, eminent alike as a physiologist (lately recipient of the Nobel Prize) and as a pacifist who has never compromised with the war spirit.

The notable features of this little book are the clearness of its diction, and the plainness with which it sets forth the fact that military glory has been the curse of France. From it I may make a few translations.

Dr. Richet gives a running account of the growth of Europe, stressing its science, literature and philosophy rather than its wars, and regarding the Reformation as a greater event than the Renaissance while deploring its aftermath of religious squabbles and atrocities. From Dr. Richet's account of the brilliant genius of Napoleon, "almost superhuman, but fatal not only to France but to the entire world," closes with these words: "Such was the fate of this prodigious man for whom posterity has shown a singular clemency. It is necessary, my child, that you should know well that through his pride he brought disasters unheard of to France and to Europe. Through him the freedom the Revolution wished to give to the world was set back sixty years. By him, Europe, forced to think of nothing but war, adopted a military regime, so stupid that today the Continent is crushed by monstrous taxes, and by armies still more monstrous. Through him, the evolution of nations, instead of moving towards peace, fraternity and independence, was turned towards war, hate and servitude. By him in fifteen years, fifteen millions of young men, the most vigorous, the boldest and most generous, have perished in the flower of life and the human race has been degraded.

"Thanks to him and to him only, France has been ruined, mutilated, humbled, twice violated by armies insolently victorious. * * * Yet she has no right to complain. *She has deserved Napoleon.* As soon as he appeared she threw herself at his feet.

"Think over this sad history in order to detest wars and conquerors."

In another chapter he says: "England has remained

*Histoire Universelle des Civilizations, aux Jeunes Gens des Ecoles de tous les Pays; par M. Charles Richet, professeur a' l' Université de Paris, Membre de l' Institut. Conciliation Internationale, Paris.

almost faithful to the great principle of free trade, while all the other countries, especially America, alas! maintain a system of protection which demoralizes and impoverishes. Peasants, everywhere, are abandoning the country for the cities, with the result that the cities, the large ones especially, are growing beyond measure at the expense of agricultural towns which become relatively depopulated.

"From 1850 to 1870 Europe was torn by stupid wars: that of Russia, 1856, of Italy, 1859, of the Danish Duchies, 1865, which ended in the battle of Sadowa and the military domination of Prussia. But of all the wars, the most stupid was that of 1870-71 which revealed the ineptitude of Napoleon III and the perfidious skill of Bismarck. By the odious treaty of Frankfurt, Alsace-Lorraine, in spite of its will to remain French, was ceded to Germany. This notable iniquity is in reality the most profound cause of the great war of four years, that is, the most cruel misfortune which through the ages has struck the civilized world.

"War and politics have sown hate, misery and sorrow. Science has spread benefits only. It is science which gives to modern times their incomparable grandeur. Science has been truly the great conqueror.

"I must speak now, my son, of one of the saddest events of history let loose by human folly, the world war of four years which has covered with ruin and misery indescribable the nations of Europe. The blundering ferocity of war, of which the present generation was victim—this is past history. The history of the future will be very different, if we know how to profit by the lessons this sad past has inflicted upon us. The task of our century is simple. It is to give power to Law, to take away the power which is not law, and to replace error by truth. Science is the great liberator * * * and for Science is necessary the union of men, that is to say, *Peace.*"

When the history of the nations and of the world is taught to children in this spirit, we need to have no fear of organizations for purposes of wholesale murder, the dominating curse of Europe through all the ages. DAVID STARR JORDAN.

Ethical Culture

This handsome volume* is published as a permanent memorial of the half-century anniversary of the founding of the first Ethical Culture Society in this country on May 15, 1876. It contains an address by Felix Adler, interpreting the significance of the movement; portraits and autobiographical sketches of Dr. Adler and seventeen of his associate leaders in this and other countries; brief articles by these leaders; and a chronological record of each of the six Ethical Societies in the United States, of the American Ethical Union, and of the International Ethical movement.

We have already paid tribute to Dr. Adler and his work in these columns (see UNITY, May 24th, page 195). Ethical Culture is remarkable for its clear identification of religion with the moral consciousness of man, and for its application of such religion in terms of education and public service. This volume contains impressive testimony of the truth to which the Ethical movement has borne witness all these years, and of the works in which this truth has been made vital. It is a worthy monument to one of the most significant spiritual achievements of our time. J. H. H.

Correspondence

From the Atlantic Monthly

Editor of UNITY:

An anonymous correspondent sends me a clipping from your issue of Monday, June 28th, in which the following ridiculous and offensive statement is made:

"We have it on excellent authority that William Randolph Hearst has recently purchased, and now owns and controls, *The Atlantic Monthly, The Century* and *McClure's Magazine.* Why do the newspapers say nothing about a momentous event of this kind in the world of journalism?"

I recall instances in which UNITY has commented with severity upon newspaper inaccuracies. May I be permitted to say that it would be difficult to find a more flagrant instance of publishing a rumor without taking the trouble to make any investigation whatsoever.

As for the facts in the above statement. *The Atlantic* has at no time been the subject of bargain, sale, or dicker since it was acquired by The Atlantic Monthly Company nearly twenty years ago.

Concerning *The Century,* I know nothing, but have no doubt that no sale has been made or is in contemplation. *McClure's* was sold to Hearst some time since, and of the fine old magazine only the name remains. It is possible that this notorious fact is the sole basis of your "excellent authority."

ELLERY SEDGWICK,
Editor.

[The statement above quoted by Mr. Sedgwick was made by a well-known journalist and author in an address delivered in New York City to an audience of hundreds of people. Assuming that the report was public property, and knowing the speaker as a trustworthy and responsible person, we felt warranted in printing his statement. In a telegram received from him in answer to inquiry from us, he says, *"Best Sedgwick deal with me directly if he desires."* We have given Mr. Sedgwick the name of our informant—well known to him, of course—and we leave them to settle their differences. Meanwhile we are deeply sorry and humbly apologize for any injustice done.—Ed.]

Senator Frazier's Resolution

Editor of UNITY:

I note that in your issue of May 24th you publish items about several moves toward peace in this and other countries. The following tells more of a move in that direction, which was mentioned in an earlier issue of your magazine:

On April 23rd Senator Lynn J. Frazier of North Dakota introduced a concurrent resolution providing for an amendment to the Constitution making war illegal and prohibiting Congress from appropriating money for war purposes. The proposed amendment reads, in part, as follows:

"War for any purpose shall be illegal, and neither the United States nor any state, territory, association or person subject to its jurisdiction shall prepare for, declare, engage in or carry on war or other armed conflict, expedition, invasion or undertaking within or without the United States, nor shall any funds be raised, appropriated or expended for such purpose."

For two years the Women's Peace Union, a national organization, with headquarters at 180 Lexington Avenue, New York City, has advocated the advancement of a similar measure; and it points out that the Constitution sanctions war, provides for an army, navy and state militia and authorizes Congress to prepare for war, declare war and appropriate money for war. That after 137 years of trial many people in this country believe that events have proved that war is neither right, nor necessary, nor expedient; that these people wish to amend the Constitution by removing the sanction for war. They wish war to be declared illegal and to deprive Congress of the power to pre-

*"The Fiftieth Anniversary of the Ethical Movement." Published by D. Appleton.

The Field

"The World is my country, to do good is my Religion."

GENERAL CONFERENCE
of the
FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION
and the
FELLOWSHIP OF YOUTH FOR PEACE
Hotel Plimpton, Watch Hill, R. I.
September 9-12, 1926

HOW SHALL WE WAGE PEACE?
A Conference to Discuss Methods of Fellowship Action

Thursday, Sept. 9:

4:00 p. m.—Tea and Welcome. Keynote Meeting. Leader: A. J. Muste.

7:30 p. m.—Outstanding Challenges to Peace. 1. Militarism in the United States—John Nevin Sayre. 2. Industrial Strife—Norman Thomas. 3. Race Conflict—Dr. G. Normil Sylvain of Haiti (expected). The above fifteen-minute addresses each followed by discussion. Chairman: A. J. Muste.

Friday, Sept. 10:

9:30 a. m.—The Conference will divide into four groups, each group to consider the development of Fellowship technique in waging peace in international, industrial and interracial affairs in the following ways: 1. Through Newspapers, Magazines and Pamphlets. Leader of discussion: 2. Through Education. Leader of discussion: 3. Through Personal Action in Situations of Conflict. Leader of discussion: Roger Baldwin. 4. Through Established Organizations. Leader of discussion: Maud Richards. Each group will appoint a Findings Committee to summarize its discussion.

7:30 p. m.—The Conference will meet as a whole to consider the findings of Groups 1 and 2 on Publicity and Education. Chairman: Norman Thomas.

Saturday, Sept. 11:

9:30 a. m.—The Conference will consider the findings of Groups 3 and 4 on Personal Action and Organizations. Chairman: Norman Thomas.

2:30 p. m.—1. Conference with Secretaries and reports of year's work of the Fellowships. 2. Discussion of plan for Reunion of Fellowship of Reconciliation and Fellowship of Youth for Peace.

7:30 p. m.—1. Adoption of plans for the year based on proposals coming out of the Conference discussions. 2. Election of Fellowship Council. Chairman: A. J. Muste.

Sunday, Sept. 12:

10 a. m.—The Religious Basis of the Fellowship Way of Life. Leader: Paul Jones.

2:30 p. m.—Signs of the Coming Friendly Society—Dr. Jesse Holmes (expected), Agnes Pollock Cooper. Chairman: Gilbert A. Beaver.

There will be a meeting of the Fellowship Council, Sunday evening.

The F. Y. P. will have a special meeting Friday afternoon.

Committee on Music and Worship: Sidney Lovett and Beatrice Price.

Monthly News Sheet

Austria.—A Conference of Anti-Militarist Youth Groups took place on May 1 and 2 at Ybbsitz in the mountains of Lower Austria. Societies represented were the War Resisters, the Young Theosophists, the Life Reformers (Naturheilverein) the Practical Idealists' Association, the Fellowship of Reconciliation and the Group for Social Work of the Viennese Student Christian Union (Akademisch-soziale Arbeitsgemeinschaft). It was decided to reconstitute the Austrian Branch of the World League of Youth, by forming a Federation of existing groups, such as has already been formed in England. The aim of the Federation is to work for World Peace, Co-operation and a New Social Order. On Sunday a large number of Socialist youth and workers from the surrounding villages visited the Conference. They took a lively part in the discussions, and very friendly relations developed between them and the members of the Conference.

Czecho-Slovakia. — Demonstrations against Militarism were arranged on April 18 by the Czech and German Social Democratic Youth in every large town. A united and energetic protest was made against the proposed introduction of military training for young people, against the withdrawal of the franchise from soldiers, and the establishment of a military budget of 1,400,000,000 crowns for 11 years. The resolution, which was everywhere adopted unanimously, embodied an appeal to Social Democratic M.P.'s to make a firm stand in Parliament in favor of total disarmament. A significant feature was the united declaration of Czechs and Germans in favor of understanding and equal rights between nationalities everywhere and especially in Czecho-Slovkia.

France.—A Reconciliation Tour was recently made by Pastor Hans Hartmann, of Solingen-Foche (Germany) at the invitation of some French Protestant pastors and the theological faculties of Paris and Montpellier. He found an interest in peace questions among the coal-miners and workers of Hénin-Liétard, led by their pastor, Heuzé. In Paris, an attentive audience at "The Union for the Peace of the World" listened to a speech on "Germany, Locarno and Geneva," and the students of theology discussed the spiritual condition of France and Germany. The idea of reconciliation was well received in the large number of towns visited, especially at Marseilles, where people of all opinions, some Catholics as well as Protestants, come together in the "Union Oberlin" for the study of social and international problems. At Strasbourg, a number of professors of the faculty of theology and of the University, and the president of the consistory board were ap-

---

pare for war, declare war or wage war; and that similar groups of men and women, organized in twenty different countries of Europe and Asia as the War Resisters' International have either adopted the same program for their respective countries or are working toward it.

Since 1789 the policy of increasing our armaments has been continued by successive administrations without consulting the people; and will undoubtedly be so continued unless a direct mandate to the contrary is given by the people.

The above amendment provides a means of consulting the people for the first time since the adoption of the Constitution about the policy of disarmament which may be successfully achieved, through a Constitutional Amendment like the one proposed. This amendment should receive the active support of all those who think war is out of date; all who realize that war creates more disputes than it settles; all who are convinced that war never lessens greed or hate, never eradicates any antagonism or causes of disagreement; all who have decided that war more often destroys than protects, life, liberty and justice; all who take literally the commandment, "Thou shalt not kill" and hold that human life should be held sacred under all circumstances; all who believe in the unity of mankind and feel that they cannot destroy others without destroying part of themselves; and, finally, by all those who, being committed to the principle of non-resistance, believe in its great power to overcome evil forces and wish to see this principle interpreted in terms of legal sanction and political action.

I also note that, in his letter, Henry W. Pinkham says: ". . . let it be firmly established that *in case of war there will be no bonds but only tax receipts, and there will not be another war.*"

Perhaps, but will it prevent the military invasion of our neighbor American republics by the U. S. military, naval or marine forces?

Not merely do we need to condemn war—as meaning the armed fighting of two or more countries against each other—but we need to equally condemn the armed invasion by one country of another (where the other does not strike back in kind). That is, we should condemn the use of armed force to assist financial and other non-military invasions of one nation by some of the people of another nation.

Of course, non-military invasions are wrong; but, to stop them we will have to go still deeper, and adopt a monetary unit which will be issuable solely for and receivable solely for one hour of adult human work.

But, in the meantime, if this nation is not to carry on anything that resembles military warfare, it does not need to be prepared for such warfare.

And the first move in that direction should be to get the people of this country to realize that it is *not* necessary for such a country as ours to be armed. A discussion of the above proposed Constitutional Amendment should help do that last.

VAUGHN BACHMAN BROKAW.

Phoenix, Arizona.

preciative listeners at a meeting of the "Chevaliers de la Paix."

Germany. — A Reconciliation Tour touching towns such as Berlin, Leipzig and Köln, was recently made by Marie Luise Moll of the International Fellowship of Reconciliation. Speaking to very varied audiences, she found a warm welcome, especially among the Youth Movement, for her message and news of work for peace in other countries. At Ober-Wesel, she addressed an enthusiastic meeting of 2,000 young people of the Hesse-Nassau Jugendring, gathered on the mountain side.

"Die Friedenswarte," the general magazine of the German peace movement, publishes in the May issue a number of articles in favor of conscientious objection to war service, thus indicating the growing interest of German peace workers in the problem of individual responsibility.

Great Britain.—Strike Mediation.—One of the features of the strike situation was the efforts at mediation by the Churches and men of good will. Shortly after the breaking off of negotiations, opinion throughout the country began to express itself in favor of an immediate resumption of negotiations. The lesson of the war had been widely and deeply learned; victory by force was the worst possible result. The leaders of the State Church and the Free Churches met together and put forward proposals calling for the resumption of the *status quo* before the break and involving a yielding of all parties. The Archbishop of Canterbury, as spokesman of the Churches' Appeal, urged the proposals in personal interviews with the Government and the leaders of both sides. The Copec Movement also lent its influence in the same direction. The strong rallying of public opinion behind the Archbishop undoubtedly stimulated action in Parliament, and eventually made it easier for the Prime Minister to take action in mediation. It is commonly agreed that the Churches by their fair proposals have greatly strengthened themselves in the confidence of the workers of the country.

Meanwhile, quite unknown to the public, certain of the members and officers of the Fellowship of Reconciliation were very active in mediation. Persons high in Cabinet and Government circles, leading coal-owners and men's leaders were visited from hour to hour. The views of the one party on the questions of controversy were interpreted to the other, and on occasion joint meetings for understanding were arranged. On all these negotiations the Fellowship was dealing not with general principles or only with the ideal spirit in which the issue should be faced, but with the concrete difficulties of a complex situation. Mediation is still proceeding between the coal-owners and the miners.

"The Seven Deadly Sins of Militarism"

An Address by
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

Single copies, 10 cents; twelve copies, $1; postpaid

Other Addresses by Mr. Holmes:
"Is Roman Catholicism a Menace to America?"
"Today's Challenge to the Jew: Advance or Retreat."
"Thomas Paine: Political and Religious Revolutionist."
"The Problem of the Unmarried"
"Great Possessions: What Are They?"
"Neglected Pleasures."
10 cents a copy, postpaid

Address: Secretary,
The Community Church
12 Park Avenue, New York City

WANTED

Private individual interested in Whitman and Traubel desires to obtain copies of the CONSERVATOR. Address: "Conservator," care of UNITY, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago.

It's a "Case" of Necessity

Your Printing will be above criticism if done by

THE OAKLAND PRESS

3913 Cottage Grove
Tel. Atlantic 1876

JULY

With its tennis and golf, its motoring and yachting days in the great out doors, makes unusually important the condition of your sports and outing apparel. Quick service so often a necessity finds expression here in our dispatch cleansing by the most approved of scientific methods.

Schumann & Co
Cleaners Dyers

PHONE DREXEL 0261 ALL DEPARTMENTS
MAIN OFFICE AND WORKS
3960 Cottage Grove Avenue

DREXEL State Bank

Cottage Grove Ave. and Oakwood Blvd.

Thirty-two years of conservative banking, combined with service and courtesy for every depositor —large or small—is the record of this bank . . . . . .

Your savings and checking account cordially invited

Resources Six and one-half Million Dollars

Your health, and the health of your entire family will be benefited by a daily glass of

Bowman DAIRY COMPANY Milk!

Phone Oakland 489 **JANITORS' SUPPLIES**

Everything in HARDWARE

AT

PORTER'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.